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The dynamics of writing can not be profoundly realized and approached unless the features of both the writing process and the written product are formally investigated, which means the student-writer and the text are predisposedly in mutual interdependence. By inference, teachers are instructed not to conform themselves with the ideas of detaching the act of writing from its target; the process of writing from the type of the discoursal text the student-writer aims to explore and create. Ulla Connor (1987) cited in Chaudron (1987 : 674) points out how various approaches to the description and evaluation of writing products take into account the processes that writers go through in constructing texts. Moreover, she demonstrates that complete inferences about writers composing processes necessarily depend on adequate analysis of written product.

In fact when writing is referred to both composition and composing or both the text and the activity, or concomitantly the finished products and the processes underlying their production are essentially included. This outlook actually reflects the alternative foci made available to those shoulderering the
assignment of teaching such a "highly specialized type of communicative competence". (Arndt, 1987: 257). Zamel (1983: 176) developed an intelligent awareness that her skilled ESL student writers have gone too far with their focusing separately on meaning in isolation alone. Hence, they have been kept away from carefully examining certain surface features of writing. If student writers are focusing on meaning, teachers should consider the need to take both product and process into consideration. Student-writers "should be taught not only heuristic devices to focus on meaning but also heuristic devices to focus on rhetorical and linguistic features after the ideas have found some form" (Raimes, 1985: 248). Zamel (1983) finds that first revisions usually address very general issues such as content, organization or purpose of the entire piece, while each subsequent revision turns to more formal considerations and finally to sentence polishing. By the same token, Nattinger (1984: 396) sums up a perspective which favourably stresses merging so as to promote the effectivity the two modes of writing exercise by reiterating that "fluency - letting ideas flow - is an immediate result and happens in the context of goal and reader expectations. As the revision gets closer to the intended meaning accuracy of form begins to be attended to".

This is also of particular importance, given the fact that many ESL teachers still do not view process approaches as applicable to or appropriate for student-writers whose English is
limited. Teachers in this case may be found inclined to give up English writing as an instructional activity and to consider the formal aspects: spelling, vocabulary and grammar as essential requirements of language. Process writing teachers do not prepare student-writers to express the kind of real writing to take essay exams, to write highly structural assignments, to write about impersonal topics, or engineer to get involved in all academic activities; hence, Liebman - Klein (1986: 784) finds the dichotomy of process and product or product and process "false and unproductive". She thinks that "such a dichotomy leads those who are concerned with teaching writing to university student to reject prematurely some valuable insights and methods". Hairstone (1982) cited in Hamp - Lyons (1986: 974) points out that Kuhn (1970) considers new paradigm to be "crude and unformed" and that since they seldom possess all the capabilities "the best part of the earlier paradigm must be preserved". Hamp - Lyons (1986: 794) in starting an argument with Horowitz (1986) declares "that attention to writing as product is essential" if successful functioning in academic discourse community is aimed, but she strongly opposes the idea to achieve the objective proposed by rejecting the process paradigm. Hamp-Lyons (1986: 794)" argues against competing paradigms for composition teaching and in favor of the search for a descriptive model which attempts to reconcile the 'product approach' ... and the 'process approach' such a reconciliation would be to the support of teachers and the benefit of learners"
So as to avoid the crisis, process proponents are invited to conform themselves to the essentials of the academic life and student-writers needs in the same manner as they behaved realistically when they reasonably complied with "their learners affective and developmental needs". So inorder to avoid pushing process approach to be identified as an" out moded paradigm" it should not be associated with "rigid rules and inflexible attitudes".

Bizzell (1982) cited in Hamp-Lyons (1986 : 793) predicts that the two modes of writing : process and product are moving toward integration. She considers language teaching composition focussing on "authentic voice" directed to discovering and describing successful writing as the primary session in the new experience. She goes further to mention that" college writing teachers frequently have found themselves at odds with the institutional goal of initiation into academic discourse". Eventually she finds those teachers once more emphasising" the traditional discourse values".

Zamel (1987 : 708) explains how "misunderstandings about process oriented instruction dichotomize the organic and integrated nature of writing into process and product". She reveals depending on classroom studies how product goals can be accommodated in non-traditional student - centered environments.

Zamel (1987) reverts to some documented research findings supporting merger of product activities with the process
paradigm. She mentions. Diaz (1985) and Hilderbrand (1985) engaging their student-writers in a great deal of subjective and personal writing but also assisting them in preparing themselves for "expository writing exam". She refers to Newkirk (1984) describing student writers involved in writing about topics of their own choice, but they were also required to produce a research paper". Diaz (1986) has also been ascribed to proclaiming some" Limited English Proficient student-writers" engaged in writing activities that promoted self-generated knowledge" but they were supposed to be prepared more efficiently for "school based writing". Finally, Ammon (1985) is documented to be engaged in observing children in classrooms "expected not only to write but to demonstrate their mastery of technical features of writing in their texts". Ammon's (1985) student writers achieved the required skill expected of them. His student-writers' "superior gains" if compared to those student-writers supervised by traditional writing concepts certifies how practitioners in writing can readily acquire "knowledge, skill and language" if they are provided with" rich, multiple and integrated experiences that help them understand how language makes meaning".

What Zamel (1987) tried to disclose can be evidently traced in those researches she referred to, to unveil an example of integration of some kind, thus enhancing the accomplishment of what has been long expected for. A pure process model of writing which can be independently complied with actually can not
even be theoretically imagined. There are no such student writers who will be found unilaterally engaged in process writing activities. Student-writers can not be expected to be inoculated against possible product additions or interferences. The dream of isolating student-writer in process vacuum is a far-fetched hope which never comes true if a favourable electicism is not sought. Leibman - Klein (1986 : 785) have best illustrated the reasons behind such an outlook when she asserts that

"People who criticize the process approach seem to treat it as some sort of monolithic entity, complete with canon and commandments,..... The process approach is not an approach, it is many approaches. There will never be a process approach because writing the process of writing - is such a complicated and rich process, involving many facts of being: cognition, emotion, sense of self, sense of others, situation, background experience, development ..... Process is not a dogma, but a concept that enables people to see writing in a new way and thereby ask questions that were not asked as long as people saw writing simply as finished products".

In fact what Zamel (1987) hinted at implies that writing process can be sophisticatedly celebrated in the presence of logical incorporation. She believes in what Shaughnessy (1977) and other theorists have claimed that", in the context of creating, sharing, and valuing meaningful context, in the context of encouraging exploration and risk taking, that product concerns can be addressed".
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Though in 70s the shift of emphasis in research from product to process has important bearings on the composing activities through which initiated ideas and meaning evolve into written texts, it is taken quite unadvisable and definitely unjustifiable to let the two modes of writing: process and product to be detached from each other in teaching or research. This advocacy can be observed well defined in Arndt's (1987 : 258-259) contribution when elaborating to neutralize the crisis by declaring that

"... at the heart of effective writing lies the techniques for successful fusion of thought and language to fit the rhetorical context - rhetorical, that is in the fundamental sense of gearing message to audience. Such techniques are responsible for matching content with form, and for ensuring that the writing is under the control of a purpose whereby an intended meaning is successfully conveyed to an intended reader. The tantalizing question, however, is whether these matching techniques are actually accessible to consciousness, and hence to observation, and hence perhaps to being taught".

All the approaches facilitating teaching and learning writing do overlap. It can be rarely claimed to find a teacher supervising a class to be mainly devoted to one approach as to exclude the others. A process oriented teacher "will still use techniques drawn from other approaches as the students need them; model paragraphs, controlled compositions, free writing, sentence exercises and paragraph analysis are useful in all
approaches. Since most teachers and books are eclectic -
drawing from everything that is available to them - . "(Raimes,
1985 : 11)" There is no one way to teach writing, but many ways.
Writing in process or product stems from the basic assumptions
that writing means writing a connected text and not just single
sentences, that writers write for a purpose and a reader, and that
the process of writing is a valuable learning tool for all our
students.

Having looked up close at the tension between process
and product and that both are realities which can not be
subjectively ignored, a tradition of writing authentically
documented can be reposed upon to declare the legitimacy of a
proposal sought to accomplish integration. In writing about
literature, this has been long experienced. When a pre established
form (e.g. expository essay about literature) is involved, the
knowledge of the literary text itself is a significant variable in the
configuration of the essay. To achieve a more successful essay
product synthesis and conscious rendering of information is
urgently required. The student writers so as to manage and
express their understanding of literature in a prescribed way have
to lean on their linguistic repertoire. Surely, it is against pure fact
to have the student-writers convinced that product does not matter.
The glamorous wit emerging before vanishing in the course of
writing process is not merely significant to the writer.
Admittedly, what the reader cares about is not what it is that is changed or the fluency in terms of which composing is carried out by the writer. Phelps (1986) in arguing for a unified theory introduces an "overarching process" as a cooperative enterprise whereby writers and readers undergo dynamic meaningful interactions. What is shared in the real world is the product, nothing else but that. So, if product is what it is shared in the real world, it is hard luck not to be shared by student-writers. In sum, writing can not be segregated from its destined target whether it is fixed or open in its form, anymore than life can be disunited from death. Only in a writing environment that complies with studying the tension between process and product can be a phenomenon of discovery which can be interpreted, can be assessed and can be considered real and lasting.

Since these two writing modes reinforce and strengthen each other, since student-writers frequently function in an English academic setting where ability to comprehend and express complex ideas with oral and written language is a requisite, and since more abstract ideas and complex concepts can be handled and presented in written forms, writing and oral skills should be learned integratively or acquired simultaneously. Indeed, all language modes are highly communicable and interrelated and draw on many of the same creative processes. Thus it is not possible or even advisable to teach in a discrete-point manner,
non integratively one single skill in isolation from the others. This does not mean, following an integrated procedure is to work on the same text in each of the four modes in turn, but it claims that student-writers recognize in the real world that they seldom exercise one skill at a time (Brookes and Grundy, 1990). The aim of an integrated approach is to enable the student-writers by depending on their ability to demonstrate their integrated multiskill competence to naturally transfer between one mode and the other. Writing demands an integrated approach just as much as the four skills: listening, reading, speaking and writing do.

In short teaching each mode of writing, process or product in isolation very often brings about unbalanced second language writing performance. Writing as process and writing as product provided a non-stop steady subject for debate and argument. It can not be denied that this tension exists in most aspects of language learning and teaching. Such oversimplistic distinction between writing as process and writing as product due to the significant role interaction existing between the two modes of writing lost color and got faded away and it can no longer be supported in the absence of a convincing rationale.

The proponents of both modes of writing process and product delivered and introduced some distinctive dimensions which can not earnestly, for further progress in style and strategy, be entertained. Adequate supportive reasons can not be forwarded
to reject the idea of integrating process with the practice of studying and even imitating written models in the classroom. Rodrigus (1985: 26-7) cited in Nunan (1991) has skillfully provided the rationale backing such stance by asserting that:

"The unfettered writing process approach has been just as artificial as the traditional high school research paper. Writing without structure accomplishes as writing a mock structure [Student-writers] need structure, they need models to practice, they need to improve even mechanical skills and they still need time to think through their ideas, to revise them, and to write for real audiences and real purposes".

Here Rosen (1994) can be seen to primarily granting the writing processes significance whereas in the mean time supporting unity for process and product by declaring.

"It is my experience that students will use, find, create and share forms of their own accord provided these other processes are in place. This is, of course, quite threatening to many teachers who thought that their role in encouraging writing was to teach writing. After all, what were all those college hours spent doing, if it wasn't learning how great writers write ? I am suggesting that this approach denies the creative base of writing. Writers need to find both the 'what' and the 'how' of writing at the same time".

Finally dichotomies as product or process, writer based or reader based, creative or functional, linear or recursive, technique or purpose, controlled or free, quantity or quality, activity or text, composition or composing, finished product or
work in progress, oral or written, cognition or insight, teachers should merely believe that these seemingly diverse, contrastive, notions are constructively complementary rather than being opposing hostile concepts. Consequently many aspects of those binary dichotomies to promote its effectivity and productivity are incorporated into one, packed into the contemporary philosophy of teaching. Fortunately, no segment has been left aside due to those dichotic crisis and tensions. Of course such a merging tendency doesn't revert the researchers, scholars, teachers as well as student-writers, however, to purely traditional product oriented, narrowly focussed instruction. (Chaudron, 1987 : 674).
PART V

CHAPTER TWO

Process and product:

An Eclectic Proposal

Due to frustration and disillusionment caused by Audio Lingual Method encountered in the late sixties and the detachment with the concept of universal method proposed by some language teaching theorists, the initiative notion of eclecticism got strongly popularized and widely circulated with myriad prompts and adaptations among practices teachers devoted to writing skill. Undoubtedly, the emergence of new ideas and innovative opinions in the domain of language pedagogy brought about quite expectedly foreseen confusion among language teachers particularly among those who were involved in developing student-writers’ potential writing abilities. Some of these writing-skill teachers found themselves reluctantly clinging to whatever vogue fad they blindly came across. Such teachers enthusiastically cast their votes for an eclectic solution for whatever problems their minds have been long untenably obsessed with, but unfortunately the eclecticism they were temporarily cornered to choose was mainly an urgent product of impertinent intuition which has been evoked by inconsistent counter-effective thinking. The rationale behind integrating the various approaches of writing
stems from such a kind of thinking which asserts that training good writers is nothing but a kind of melting pot into which a little of everything can be added, thus fulfilling the requirements of methods quite expected to emerge on the scene. Logicians dealing with the concept of comprehensive efficiency told us that any purposeful complex activity consists of a set of actions which must be coherently in consistence matched with each other. That is, each of them should be reinforced by the preceding one and should in turn support and reinforce the following one, so that all of them are to be found unanimously of a single unitary sharing common goal.

Most of the flawed and futile language teaching haphazardly entertained today can be evidently ascribed to those teaching language theorists advocating the propagation of a so-called infertile hypocratic counter productive practical eclecticism mostly argued not to be apt to meet the criterion of efficiency. Language pedagogy today terribly suffers from such a shortcoming. Practical intuitive eclecticism, accordingly, can not be exploited to fulfil the requirements of a norm-referenced optimal pedagogical solution. Educational expertise involved in training writing teachers aiming at relieving student-writers clamorous endeavours to accomplish their course objectives should deliberately be made conscious of such sterile fantasies and futile pipe-dreams. We are not academically confident about the instructions injected by some theorists into the minds of practising teachers, as to be intuitively
creative and particularly elective. An advice to strictly keep away from methodology may foster prescriptivism to unintentionally bring about unexpected hazardous deterring adverse outcomes.

The idea that teachers need to be creative is indispensable, but this creativity on demand should be based on a set of explicitly formulated educational principles derived from the multiple variables manifested in pedagogical fundamentals. Consequently in terms of some scientifically supported underlying principles, the teachers' experiences can be rendered interpretable besides invigorating the teachers' capacities in developing their own narrow procedures for every specific unrecycled situation they may encounter of course, merely exposing writing teachers to the scholastic knowledge of Linguistics, Sociolinguistics. First and Second Language Acquisition as well as an outline of the History of Teaching Writing Skill can not, of course, be accounted for as adequate enough to encourage them to work out their own private hand-made mind-moven teaching theories in tandem of which qualified potential professionals can be trained.

The electic approach to language teaching as it is commonly practiced today is reasonably rejected as an optimal solution. Practical electicism as it was stated formerly is found to be suffering from the absence of efficiency whereas theoretical electicism is not enjoying the privilege of a logical background.
The idea of theoretical eclecticism is quite analogous in destiny to intuitive practical eclecticism in its falling short as far as embodying a premise which can be logically or scientifically maintained. Scholars in such circumstances are left with no choice but to develop a new theory or modify the theories which they have in possession when they aim at mediating in between or reconciling a couple of contradictory advocacies of almost two or more than two rival expediants (Palmer 1921) or almost two independent, theories say, product based and process oriented tendencies in writing. As a result, initiating a theory on the basis of eclecticism does not inform any scholarly thinking of distinct value, unique quality or a significant teaching or learning strategy. There does not exist any type of eclectic strategy which can be considered to be constructively helpful in pushing the writing industry overwhelmingly forward.

Admittedly all those methods and approaches emerging as vogues or even fads carry embedded in themselves some valuable insights and procedures which can be coherently and systematically matched. Thus integrating a comprehensive composite system of pedagogy. Consequently, the language educator's role can be redefined as flexible and on the move, steadily in revising, modifying and expanding the system of language teaching and obviously as far as our dichotomy process and product is concerned this is not an exception. This can only be accomplished when the new functions brought into existence by
the new procedures are diligently analyzed, defined and described to be suitably adjusted and coherently incorporated in the most appropriate phase or stage in the chain of language teaching/learning process.

Systematic electicism is hopefully expected to yield some favourable learning and teaching experience though some deficiencies are observed in practice due to its resisting being accurately and explicitly defined in compliance with theories of learning. Teachers training student-writers are quite confused in reference to what procedures can be found most fittingly apt to develop the required writing competency considerably anticipated to be accomplished by students as writers. Since teachers try their best to use the classroom time in the most proper way, they resort to choosing only the most essential procedures nucleated in the language and in our dichotic case in writing pedagogy. The proponents of systematic electicism will inevitably face the problem of feeling disabled, decapacitated as far as selecting out the most efficient procedures hopefully looked forward to cherish the required writing competency; therefore, the hazards of appealing to blindfold predictions and subjectivism besides exercising the most radical idiosyncrasy is potentially existent. As Chastain (1988 : 110) claims "both productive and unproductive activities possible in any classroom, and teachers should not excuse ineffectiveness as eclecticism", or an advocacy or an
excuse or a propagation for a kind of eclecticism which can be nothing but "an excuse for irresponsible ad-hocery". (Widdowson, 1979 : 243). Needless to say, adherents of systematic eclecticism will find it seriously problematic to process their strategy in the absence of required guidances and stipulated principles i.e. the selection and combination of of an elective set of derivative aspects of diverse approaches; say, process and product biases and somehow possibly the injection of genre and academic stylistics will be problematically processed if directive guidances and rehearsed principles are not reverted to. In fact Rivers (1981 : 54) refers to palmer (1925) recommending the multiple line eclectic approach. She advises teachers to judiciously pick out without prejudice all that is likely "to be facilitating factors in teaching".

Concurrent combination of the approaches with the purpose of enhancing the development of language learning abilities can be openly announced to be justifiably unacceptable. Consequently, the idea of a simultaneous combination of two basic teaching approaches; product and process, or even product, process, genre and academic approach is rejected. Actually the whole case, due to its failure in inaugurating maximum teaching efficiency is cynically treated and approached. The three types of eclectic proposals are proved not to be informing conclusive solutions for the possibilities the diverse approaches to writing: process and
product academic or genre. Language pedagogy in fact does not approve such concurrent combinations. Practical, intuitive eclecticism is not only found dubious but quite non-dependable. Theoretical eclecticism, although potentially imagined, does not practically exist. Moreover the systematic eclecticism is theoretically found to be inadequate, thus can not in practice fulfil the pre-stipulated objectives.

Still, eclecticism can not be disregarded or given up since it is accounted for to be very advantageous with teaching programmes shouldering the ideas of combining the two or four approaches to writing. In fact some teachers "can not afford the luxury of complete dedication to teach new method or approach which comes to vogue" (Rivers, 1981 : 54), where as" knowledge indicates that no single approach is the most productive for all students in all situations". (Chastain, 1988 : 110). To Stern (1983 : 29) consistency does not necessarily mean" the exclusive application of a particular pedagogic, linguistic or psychological theory". He extends over to conclude that many teachers are eclectic and they are of the kind that do not "subscribe to distinct language teaching approach". Of course he takes up such a stance without ignoring the idea that different eclectic choices exist among "different schools of thought".

Sweet (1899) believed that a good method must be "comprehensive and eclectic ... a mean between unyielding conservatism on the one hand and reckless radicalism on the
other". Accordingly, so as to unite product and process in teaching and learning writing, the "rival expediants" (Palmer 1921) can be separately embodied in the curriculum so that each serve orderly and proportionably to fulfil anticipated functions. Despite the fact that eclecticism is untenable and unable a "prudent eclecticism" (Marckwardt, 1973 cited in Celce-Murcia 1979) can be worked out to have the teachers training student-writers fashion their own method consistent with the present understanding of what language is and how it is learned Ann c. Newton (1962 cited in Celce-Murcia 1979) words can be displayed here to focus one intentional attitude about eclecticism. She extends her view by declaring that:

"An approach that is truly eclectic makes the greatest demands on teachers. It requires them to know enough about various sources, systems, and styles of teaching to choose wisely between what is good for their particular purposes and what is useful. It requires of them both an intelligent skepticism and a ready enthusiasm; a willingness to reject both old and new techniques that seem unsuitable and an eagerness to refresh their teaching with useful adaptations of techniques both new and old. To do this intelligently they must be well informed about the methods and techniques that are available to them. Then they can wisely 'adapt, not adopt'".

In view of such awarinesses developed through close observation of multiple stances toward eclecticism, an integrated proposal embracing the process - product dichotomy can be put
The eclectic alternative that can be proposed to serve our purpose is the temporal consecutive version of merging thought and theories. On this ground, the notion of various consecutive combinations of our two approaches of writing can be explicitly introduced and variations of such combinations can be worked out ready to have its validity, reliability, practicality besides its applicability cross checked and examined. It has to be emphasized right here at once, however, that they are combined only in the consecutive sense of planning a writing course in such a way that for some period of time one of these approaches is applied and then the writing teacher in proper time, shifts to another, which in turn is applied for a relatively long period. Each of these possible binaries; 'product to follow process' or 'process to follow product' will be briefly described and analyzed. Configurations of the student - writers and contextual variables can make a constructive, temporal eclectic combination more efficient than a pure, unmixed approach. Eclectic Strategy as proposed to be provisionally sequential can be profitably applied to remedial teaching which in turn is found quite justifiable by the information processing schema.

This is quite acceptable and also undeniable that exclusive use of one definite approach creates its momentum and produces a snowball effect, in the sense that the student writers become increasingly proficient in a certain way of learning and thus can
gradually improve the manifestation and the utilization of their learning writing experiences.

Obviously, this growing effectiveness of learning makes sense only if a given way of learning writing contributes to the emergence of L₂ writing competency. It usually happens when the combination of particular approaches is dexterously examined with one another. Sometimes, it can be inferred either to be incompatible with the principles of those approaches; so when found counteracting the purposes previously prescribed, it causes demotion rather than promotion in teaching/learning efficiency. Thus, it is obvious that product-based writing is not compatible by analysis, definition and description with the process oriented approach when simultaneously applied. The student-writer is not allowed to develop that type of writing competency which enables him to express himself freely and fluently. It may enable the student writer to produce correct sentences in all the reconstructive sense but unluckily it hampers their communicative tendencies to create a conceptually driven cohesive-coherent text on the discourse level expected to be comprehensively interpreted in a top-drown style of understanding. Such student-writers are found sententially dynamic whereas intersententially they are decapacitated.

Accordingly, we are left with the experimental possibility of combining the product paradigm with the process scheme. This
combination is proved to be practically feasible. Teachers who are inclined to some kind of compromise between the traditional orientation and the concepts of teaching and learning are naturally inspired by L₁ and L₂ research in writing. However, on closer examination, this particular combination does not make much pedagogical sense since it does not guarantee any increased efficiency of teaching, but quite possible vice-versa. It may even downgrade the effectiveness of these approaches when used separately in isolation. This is because the reconstructive activities will get utterly confused at the beginning and will eventually tend to treat one of these two types of writing activities as their real learning writing experience while the other type is treated as purely academic exercise of little consequence. In this way, the careful student-writers will put their utmost efforts into product where as the adventurous type will innately focus mainly on communicative process operations.

The idea of incorporating process into product or product into process is almost to a certain extent parallel with integrating grammatical and functional teaching in communicative language teaching or matching structural and functional aspects of language so as to fulfil the objectives of a kind of programme. (Richards and Rodger, 1986: 66). As well, it can be claimed to serve as a cognate of integrating reconstructive and communicative strategies in language teaching. The reconstructive strategy of learning stresses controlled, gradual development of competence.
in the target language. It is based on a text, spoken or written which provides the learner with the linguistic means in the form of syntactic structures, lexical items, phrases, collocations, etc... needed for the successful and accurate implementation of a productive task assigned by the teacher. But communicative strategy considers a learning strategy with attempted communication; not only meaning from the early outset to enable learners realize messages produced by the speaker but also to produce utterances expressing their meanings and their ideas.

Process - product assembly can also be analogically considered with Brumfit's (1984, 1985 : 77-8) celebrated pedagogical schema when he claims language teaching learning process as comprising a sequence of 'fluency' and 'accuracy' type of activities predominates the early stages of learning whereas the 'fluency' activities enjoy the same privilege in the later stages when 'accuracy' activities are subordinated. In fact 'fluency' work corresponds to the concept of communicative language teaching, but the 'accuracy' wise type of work though partly co-inciding with reconstructive learning activities carried out by learners, it is mainly accounted for to be realized in agreement with monitoring, thus conforming Krashen's (1977, 1981 1982, 1985) view model regarding second language acquisition.

Merging product and process approaches to writing can be approximately brought into resemblance with Krashen's (1977,
1981, 1982, 1985) 'Monitor Model' and the 'Acquisition - Learning Hypothesis' according to which Krashen proposed "adult second language learners undergo two means of target language internalization" (Brown 1987: 187) i.e. developing competence (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 131) Children in terms of such a view stance can acquire or learn language.

By acquisition krashen means a subconscious process abiding to the naturalistic first language development in children. Learning, by contrast, is defined as the efforts exerted to develop conscious rules about the formal aspects of language. The possession of such a kind of knowledge which can be rehearsed on demand evolves in a formal context of learning. According to such a theory learning "can not lead to acquisition". In tandem with this, the consecutive temporal eclectic alternative which proposes product activities followed by process demonstrations, will be treated in such away that does not lead to process. But the whole theory can provide adequate amount of justifications to advocate a pedagogical attitude which claims that varying degrees of learning and acquisition in second language occur. If this can be put in other words, we can assert as a conclusion, that student-writers essentially require training in both process and product writing activities to acquire some kind of adventurous fluency type of mastery of writing by linear alternate appeal to process and product.
Actually what Krashen's theory suffers is the "bold but brash" (Brown 1987: 189) advocacy which claims that acquisition and learning are mutually exclusive categories. Brown (1987: 189) thinks that such "dichotomies serve simply to define the end points of a continuum, not mutually exclusive categories". Whereby product and process approaches to writing cannot be separately treated to arise a cumulative effect, but advisably, it can be viewed as a continuum. This continuum can begin with the uncontrolled process orientations ranging to the highly product calculations.

Krashen's simplistic fuzzy distinction between unconscious acquisition and conscious learning due to its inadequacy and inefficiency as a model for learning is seriously called into question and intensely debated by McLaughlin (1978) and Bialystok (1978, 1981, 1983) and led to a viable provocative dichotomies according to which plausible second language acquisition models were scholastically brought into existence. McLaughlin (1978) conceptualized a second language acquisition model through which a temporarily controlled and a relatively permanent automatic processing can be viewed. Such binary conceptualization can occur both with focal or peripheral concern. On this basis product oriented writing accordingly can be viewed as controlled focal type of processing whereas the process scheme generally entails an automatic peripheral focus.
In view of what has been referred to regarding Mc Laughlin's scholastic views, a strong claim can be put forward to stress the inseparability of process oriented and product based approaches to writing. Undeniably, writing of whatever kind it may be is inherently inclined to a process - product oriented procedure in which two sets of biased techniques consciously or unconsciously are implemented to let a finished product emerge. Abiding to such a genuine predisposition in writing as a language skill, our hard attempt to aggregate the tendencies of process and product in writing is nothing but flying with true nature of things invisibly surrounding us. Teachers are unintentionally driven biased to one of those two approaches in developing writing capacities. Despite their being unskeptically biased, whether process driven or product bound, student-writers are subconsciously and defenselessly involved in a process - product kind of interactional writing activity. The question which still remains with us is how to enhance and activate those frequently processed authentic potentialities.

One more dichotic modelling for second language acquisition worthy to be mentioned here is Bialstok's (1978). She drew a distinction between explicit and implicit kind of linguistic knowledge. Explicit knowledge to Bialstok are facts honed about language whereas implicit knowledge constitute that type of information which can be automatically and spontaneously
processed on demand. Process and product in view of this, as implicit and explicit reservoir of knowledge are found to be supportive as far as facilitating student-writers task of writing to accomplish active cognitive supervising activity. Student-writers depending on streamlining twin-reference type of knowledge create meaning to be recreated by geared potential readers. (Chastain, 1988 : 244). Teachers are invited to reconsider their approaches to teaching writing; consequently student writing behaviours and written products may be found accordingly improved. Intuitions and initiations should be beneficially fostered to merit a constructive, cumulative, consecutive infusion of both process and product to alleviate the dichotic tension and elevate the urge of writing as a process of learning and discovery. Student-writers then write composing uncritically for meaningful culminations; thus by creating the momentum required, means and ends meet at prosperous strtegic confluences.

To conclude, as it has been discussed previously in part (III), the two approaches to writing: process and product as described are distinctly and radically contrastive in properties. The approaches mentioned are sharply diverse in planning, syllabus, and classroom procedures; therefore, if they are simultaneously mixed, the outcome does not lead or end up with increased teaching or learning efficiency. Moreover, the procedures and techniques practically used by teachers in the classroom are not
clearly defined with reference to detracting contrastive properties existing between process and product. The fact is that almost all teachers involuntarily tend to be eclectic and non-deliberately more or less, avoid procedural consistency when practically exercising teaching. The two approaches due to the absence of compatibility between them if simultaneously interfused, conflict in meeting their purposes which of course lowers the accomplishments planned for. Student-writers who constantly have to shift from product to process and back to product activities will be consequently preplexed in managing themselves and will eventually come up with a decisive choice of one of the approaches as their preferred schemes in writing. Obviously the other alternative will be nothing but of a little academic value. Besides, student-writers, when simultaneously involved, will be technically metamorphesized. The careful student-writers put most of their efforts into product oriented activities where the adventurous type will do the opposite. In such circumstances, the two types of student-writers can do better if they are exclusively taught to abide by the writing performances which suit their true behavioural natura of their academic personality preferences.
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CHAPTER THREE

Process and Product:

Consecutive Eclectic Proposals

Since the concept of the two prototypical teaching approaches: process and product as presented in the project do not only have a prescriptive value but also a descriptive one, as well, whatever procedures are made available in real-life teaching situation can be categorized as to be referring to them. These procedures, being prototypical, can be accounted for as wholly product based or wholly process-wise. Some of the procedures may only have some ties with the prototype which will be categorized a predominantly product based or predominantly process-wise. Accordingly, procedures exploited by a classroom teacher can be considered as purely process wise or purely product based when most of the procedures employed by the teacher belongs to the prototype in question. Otherwise, they should be culminated as predominantly product based or predominantly process wise or as a merger approach displaying eclectic bias. Unluckily, considering the criterion, allocating higher effectiveness to a uniform approach rather than to an eclectic one, the predominant product based or the predominant process wise can not grant maximum teaching or learning efficiency. With this type of attitudinal accountancy, the last
hope for a simultaneous application of two approaches proves to be sterile without any academic accomplishment in view. As it has been pointed out before, the optimal solution which can be found advisable for integrating process and product approaches is the consecutive eclecticism, according to which teaching and learning gradually and patiently or consciously and unconsciously sets out creeping and evolving from one into another, thus accomplishing an unfelt integrated oneness. Such proposal, to consecutively weld process and product, can be well realized and manifested with the following possible experimental combinations.

(1) The product approach followed by the process approach.

(2) The process approach followed by the product approach.

*Consecutive Combination I.*

The product approach followed by the process approach

The combination of product approach followed by the process approach is somewhat irrationally matched. The point is that the process approach enthusiastically strives for a deliberate attempt encouraging the student-writers to diligently develop awarenesses and catch up with the internalized natural tendency of language which accommodates the universal process shared between \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \). By the
same token writing as a skill abides by those universals already found in languages. In process approach the student-writers capitalize on negotiating, exploring and creating meaning rather than caring for the formal aspects of the language. Student-writers by abiding to process approach start their productive attempts experimenting extremely concise type of writing which can be reduced into a number of series of isolated or connected words. Having undergone this, they try their hands in some skeletal sentences stuffed with content words, function words, which can be continuously done generating concise chunks of discourse. The errors which are made by the student-writers are not corrected but tolerated or ignored provided that the sentences produced make sense to audiences, not deterring communication to effectively occur. The sentences which are produced accordingly may be recognized as malformed and are quite acceptable. Product approach on the other hand discourages the student-writer to adapt themselves to natural flow in developing writing competency but they are not only allowed to cherish an experience in making meaning in their creation of written discourse but also to develop conscious awarenesses about the formal details of language. Following the product approach style, student-writers are not only expected to generate semantically well-formed sentences but also grammatically correct forms considerably supervised by explicit feedback reflected by the teacher, as well. In fact product style of writing maintains accuracy work whereas the process version considers fluency activities as part of its procedural preferences.
Those student-writer's (learner's) factors and contextual features variables accordingly which agree properly with product styles of writing are distinctly regarded unfavourable in application to process school of writing. Therefore, it is obvious that some warming preparatory session of experiencing with product tactiques in writing is the most inhibiting kind of applicable method student-writers may undergo. Student-writers will be rather detered and blocked for the subsequent turn they are supposed to be introduced to i.e. process writing. This conflicting emerging stance approves how product tendencies strongly contradict and terribly defeat communicative process writing expectations. Adequately the combination in question: 'product to be followed by process' seem to be quite not striding along with the logical reasoning expected.

Although the reasoning done as regarding combination I is quite correct, it can be assumed here that in the fulfilment of a simultaneous eclecticism it is primarily conditional to provide a consecutive eclectic configuration which may cumulatively end up with concurrent integration of both approaches at hand. In some situations such a composite can be implemented to achieve some favourable accomplishments. A situation which favours the use of product style of teaching just within a short course duration can develop that type of competence that allows student-writers to conveniently function in some basic communicative process writing situations. Our combination in question can be employed in an almost just a short period of intensive course where the
main purpose of the product preparatory stage is to teach the essentials of the language required. Student-writers then can be trained to put the little that they have learned to the best possible advantage and to the broadest possible range of uses in their classroom writing activities rather than insisting on error free type of sentences produced for meaningful contacts.

As regarding the allocation of time, since the product teaching session in this eclectic consecutive combination is carefully shouldring the nucleation of that kind of competence according to which the process activity can be typically realized and activated, most of the time provided will be allocated to product activities. An almost quarter of the whole duration allotted will be devoted to process teacher’s priorities in the consecutive continuum.

To work out a conclusion regarding the consecutive eclectic combination I as expected, the proposed gradual temporal sequence can not be positively implemented as appropriate unparalleled solution for such a kind of a case in writing. Of course, it can be rarely put forward as reconciliation choice of congregation regarding the two approaches concerned. Unless the situation formerly mentioned can be adequately provided, it can not be looked forward to accomplish maximum efficiency in teaching and learning the writing skill. As pointed out previously, due to scarcity of the favourable situations, it can not be effectively implemented. Such a combination can not be strongly and confidently supported and recommended as an optimal
solution for the case we have embarked on, though it has been long patiently and meticulously inspected and detected in an initiative research exploring to find a decisive solution for the writing enterprise.

Consecutive Combination II:

The process approach followed by the product approach

That product stage is an inescapable outcome of predisposed, prewired, blueprint of process writing activities can not be absolutely denied. So as to find reasonable justifications for adopting such a kind of an attitude, the details of the activities which have been introduced and recommended to meet the advanced behavioural requirements of the process scheme can be referred and alluded to. When student-writers come close approaching the product phase they naturally give up abiding strictly and unceasingly by process strategies and styles. They no longer deliberately emphasise intensive meaning-negotiated interactional efforts. They do not show much of interest and will in creating longer texts based mainly on large amount of background reading. Certainly, interactional writing activities in the earlier stages of process experience may come up with various types of writing specimen which may be primarily as warming-up starting-points for spontaneous, extemporaneous, on-the-spur-of-the-moment type of experiment. Of course, teachers training student-writers to be
initiated into process scheme behaviours will be found quite satisfied when they find their trainees successfully preoccupied with authentic writing, developing a totally unpredictable piece of product i.e. a genuinely unplanned chunk of functional discourse discovery. Student-writers in handling advanced process assignment, their nature and policy take up a different strategic communicative stance. Student-writers involved in such a level of process writing behaviour are required to individually or collectively undergo writing projects as reports or arguments so as to be presented for peer response in class. Such type of assignments actually entail reading preparation based on various texts providing the necessary background knowledge. These writing activities as a matter of fact, requires a lot of preplanned discourse whereas some others may not need preparation of any kind which may cover the production of some unpredestinated discourse. Naturally it can be claimed here that these writing activities can no longer be specifically identified as being exclusively process labeled ones. Obviously they can be utilized integrated in the second phase of writing within the skeleton of a product schedule according to which the production of L₂ written discourse by the learner should be based on language models extracted from well formed written texts. However, this factor is not consciously considered since within the process framework, accuracy is not an ultimate stipulated goal which must be strictly complied with; besides, errors are deliberately tolerated. If happens accuracy is to be
achieved, this involuntarily and effortlessly occurs but not as a result of teacher's or student-writer's purposeful trials.

Additionally, this type of writing can also mark a shift of emphasis from fluency activities to fluency abiding to accuracy requirements as well. Exactly at this point, a concurrent simultaneous process - product interaction can be claimed to be starting when both fluency and accuracy turn out to be the immediate constituents. To achieve this, the writing - teacher may openly announce to student - writers that they are for the time being entering a new stage in their learning cycle during which they have to pay more attention to accuracy if compared to the former stage. In order to motivate the student - writers to earnestly strive for accuracy, the process writing teacher may initiate sociolinguistic arguments attracting their attentions to their careers and the social role they are supposed to play in the target language. Student-writers then are instructed to direct their awarenesses to the significance of the well formedness of their sentences so as to achieve purposeful communication with real audiences. The accomplishment of such a goal if desired requires systematic correction of the student - writer's errors due to the deterring interference it exerts on the communicative fluent continuity. Process writing teachers are not advised to exercise immediate direct error correction. To make up for this, some techniques can be utilized to reasonably delay error correction. People can be more careful and get their final drafts righter when they spend some of their time
"unhooking themselves from the demands of audience and inviting themselves to get it wrong" (Elbow, 1985: 288).

During process product stage teaching the L2 grammar explicitly is assessed to be perfectly consistent with the product-oriented approach to writing. Of course, to process writing teachers, embarking on such an assignment means nothing but implicit endeavours at furnishing conscious raising and awareness promotion to their student-writers; in other words, assisting student-writers to involuntarily render the implicitly acquired knowledge during the process stage into explicit type of realizations. A higher degree of accuracy is expected to be attained if students are invited to be involved consciously in mastering pedagogical grammatical rules. Student writers in dealing with blind spots in L2 grammar need to submit themselves to some due exercises of this category. Although grammar is not fully qualified to fight, neutralize or suppress fossilization acquired due to error tolerance, error ignorance, delaying access to immediate feedback, providing limited type of response to product along with the primary process stage, some motivated careful type student-writers can advantageously benefit from the exigences of circumstances emerging to attain higher degree of accuracy.

The temporal consecutive combination, 'process to be followed by product' enjoys the prestige of a high pedagogical value as maintaining the requirement of securing maximum teaching efficiency.
On the one hand the combination forwarded is biased toward using the principles of product writing which are accounted for as natural effortless consequence of process writing application. In fact exposure to circumstantial obligations while undergoing the writing experience as a mode of discovery learning evolves the peaceful dichotomic coexistence long awaited for to occur in due course. The farfetched integration dream draw near close in view. Some optimistic hopes of reconciling the conflicting procedures to constructively coordinate is flashing out the happy epiphany of process product marriage of becoming one. This momentum actually can not be harnassed unless process writing phase as an essential prerequisite is primarily undergone. Since product activities previously alluded to are the inevitable by-products which can not be discarded. Student-writer's process immersion is the fitting experience without which the skill of writing may not flourish or invigorate at all. Obviously student-writers abiding to the nature of language acquisition should voluntarily commence writing with process syllabus and to involuntarily end with product procedures. This investigation believes once product erupts as a natural emergence of following process styles in writing the act of dichotomizing process and product will not occur, but on the contrary, their collateral flow will be sustained. Process and product will be kept inseparably flowing united for ever. Our mature combination is a method in teaching and learning writing the denial of which admittedly turns the sweet experience of writing
unwillingly sour. It can be insistingly claimed that the consecutive eclectic combination II. Process to be followed by product can schematically evolve into a concurrent simultaneous eclecticism i.e. the temporal version turns hard into a permanent one the separation of which is deliberately or non-deliberately is impossible.

To inquire the other dimensions round, product principles when introduced to complement the process journey can be basically viewed as reconstructive strategies or neutralizing agents specifically prescribed for student-writers abiding cooperatively and non-defensively to process writing behavioural instructions. Student-writers when undergoing combination II due to unfettered communication in writing due to the fact that they are not served corrective feedback and they are provided true chances in exercising unfrustrated, stress reduced communicative writing they will be possibly deflected with serious possible type of pedginization and fossilization. When those student-writer's process inclinations are entertained with product precision preferences, a non deliberately defossilized and depedginized interlanguage system of language can be reconstructed in terms of which the student-writers can work out their unimpaired language faculties incorporated with rich intuitions to let that level of typical product stem out.

The question of allocating adequate amount of time to either of those two stages can not be resolved by decisive prescription. This is
an open-ended case which can only be judged by the exigencies of upcoming circumstances. Basically, this should be pointed out that student-writers will not be introduced to product activities unless they are patiently immersed in process writing functions and demonstrations. Of course undergoing such process experiences every writing curriculum enthusiastically strives to accomplish without any type of hesitation or delay.

As far as favourable teaching conditions required to have combination II meet maximum efficiency is concerned due to precedence granted to process over product and its obligations to secure successful functioning, process styles in teaching and learning writing are less broadly defined and described if compared to the product paradigm. Student-writers (Learner's) factors in collaboration provides the student-writers with the ability of constructing and communicating freely and meaningfully through well-formed sentences cohesively and coherently congregated as discoursal chunks. As formerly ascribed to once product oriented activities are introduced to be observed by student-writers, they are to be kept to be practised to the very end of the formally stipulated course, and even when no syllabus of any kind can be found in view to comply with process details can be logically and reasonably found integrated to cummulatively create that maximum momentum contextual variables dominated by process communicative tendencies can be committedly accounted for to facilitate the logical adoption of
combination II as an optimal reconciliatory settlement for a crusade project sincerely meant for developing student - writer's abilities in writing.

Depending on student - writer's (Learner's) factors and contextual variables what combination II aims at fulfilling can be systematically inferred. Accordingly contexts characterized by low intensity of teaching, large classes, predominance of careful student - writers and writing teachers with rather poor proficiency in L_2 can not be regarded as something quite appropriate for the application of combination II: 'process to be followed by product'. In case combination II: process to be followed by product is to be successfully dramatized, a context characterized by high intensity of teaching, a predominance of adventurous learners and teachers with adequate level of proficiency in the L_2 and a small class is essentially and indispensibly required.

In conclusion, the analysis done as far as combination II is concerned brings forth the discussion of eclectic integration of product and process or process and product to an end. A conclusive description displaying the question of what particular context of language teaching best suits each of the two combination I and II can be illustratively and economically summed up in Table (III). It is meticulously worked out to strictly comply with student writer's (Learner's) factors and contextual variables.
### TABLE (V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Consecutive Combination</th>
<th>Consecutive Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Followed byprocess</td>
<td>Process followed byproduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Learner factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personality variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the careful type</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the adventurous type</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Contextual factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intensity of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. intensive teaching</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. non-intensive teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Size of class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. small class</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. large classes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. teachers with low proficiency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. teachers with poor stamina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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